arXiv:1407.6886v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 25 Jul 2014

Properties of an almost localized Fermi liquid in applied magnetic field revisited: Statistically consistent Gutzwiller approach

Marcin M. Wysokiński

E-mail: marcin.wysokinski@uj.edu.pl
Marian Smoluchowski Institute of Physics, Jagiellonian University, Reymonta 4, PL-30-059 Kraków, Poland

Jozef Spałek

E-mail: ufspalek@if.uj.edu.pl
Marian Smoluchowski Institute of Physics, Jagiellonian University, Reymonta 4, PL-30-059 Kraków, Poland
Academic Centre for Materials and Nanotechnology (ACMiN) and Faculty of Physics and Applied Computer Science, AGH University of Science and Technology, Al. Mickiewicza 30, PL-30-059 Kraków, Poland

Abstract. We discuss the Hubbard model in an applied magnetic field and analyze the properties of neutral spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ fermions within the so-called *statistically consistent Gutzwiller approximation* (SGA). The magnetization curve reproduces in a semiquantitative manner the experimental data for liquid ^{3}He in the regime of moderate correlations and in the presence of small number of vacant cells, modeled by a non-half filled-band situation, when a small number of vacancies ($\sim 5\%$) is introduced in the virtual fcc lattice. We also present the results for the magnetic susceptibility and the specific heat, in which a *metamagnetic-like* behavior is also singled out in a non-half-filled band case.

PACS numbers: 71.27.+a,67.30.E-,67.30.ep

1. Introduction

In condensed matter physics the systems with moderate to strong local correlations such as almost-localized electron systems, heavy-fermion metals, liquid ^{3}He, and selected cold atomic systems in optical lattices, have been extensively studied during the last decades. On the other hand, starting from the seminal Landau papers on theory of Fermi liquid[1, 2] as a direct generalization of the concept of electron gas, it becomes unquestionable that interaction between fermions is the source of their nontrivial physical properties even before the Mott transition to the localized state takes place for either sufficiently strong interactions or low density. Original Landau formulation[1], despite being in essence phenomenological provided, inter alia, a good qualitative rationalization of the observed effective mass enhancement of ^{3}He atoms in the liquid state[3, 4, 5, 6] and that of electrons in metals. However, the Landau Fermi liquid theory turned out to be insufficient to account for specific more sophisticated effects of the correlations, such as the Mott (Mott-Hubbard) localization[7] or the appearance of spin-dependent effective masses of quasiparticles[8] or the observation of metamagnetism of itinerant almost localized and correlated fermions[9]. Note that by *correlated fermions* or a *correlated Fermi liquid* we understand the system for which the kinetic or Fermi energy (per particle) is comparable or even smaller than the interaction energy per particle. Therefore, strictly speaking, one should term those systems as *strongly interacting*, but that particular phrase is reserved for high-energy interactions of elementary particles. Similar correlated states appear also there, as e.g. the deconfinement transition of a condensed hadron matter into the quark-gluon plasma contains the principal features of the Mott localization-delocalization transition[10, 11]. Hence the concept of an almost localized Fermi liquid seems to have a universal meaning in condensed matter physics.

One of the basic microscopic models of the correlated fermions for the lattice systems is the Hubbard model, accounting for a balance between the kinetic energy of moving fermions (hopping energy) and the effective local repulsive interaction U, whenever two fermions with opposite spins (or other internal quantum number) occupy the same site (cell) and the same orbital (Wannier) state (cf. Fig.1 for visualization of such state). Within this model, not only the principal predictions of the Landau Fermi-liquid theory have been derived[9, 12], but also a unique explanation of the correlation-driven Mott metal-insulator transition[7] and the emergence of d-wave pairing have been discussed[13]. Importance of the Hubbard model manifests itself also as the basis of derivation of the so-called $t - J$ model, which turned out to be very successful in description of the high temperature superconductivity in the cuprates (cf. e.g. Ref. [[14]]).

An important approach to solving the Hubbard model is the variational Gutzwiller wave function (GWF)[15, 16] and its simplified version - the Gutzwiller approximation (GA)[17, 7]. Those methods are based on the paradigm of optimizing the number of doubly occupied sites (cells) via which we optimize the local repulsive energy balancing the renormalized by them the band energy. In effect, simpler GA approach leads among

others to a renormalized mass of the quasiparticles in a direct manner which becomes divergent at the Mott-Hubbard localization [18, 19], as well as leads concomitantly to the infinite zero field magnetic susceptibility in the paramagnetic state[20]. Although GA is strictly speaking, exact only for lattice of infinite dimensionality[7], it may provide a good description of almost localized systems above the so-called upper critical dimensionality (not yet determined) for fermions. Minimally, it plays the role of a mean field theory. Among other techniques frequently applied to the Hubbard model are also the dynamical mean-field theory (DMFT)[21] or the quantum Monte Carlo (QMC)[22] methods.

Recently, we have discovered statistical inconsistencies in GA when one includes the magnetic field via the Zeeman term and have provided the necessary correction to the GA approach. The extended approach called statistically-consistent Gutzwiller approximation (SGA) was successfully also applied to the t-J[14, 23, 24], t-J-U[25] and to periodic Anderson models[26] to describe both magnetism and superconductivity. SGA is of the same class approach as GA (exact in the infinite-dimension limit[7]), but additionally is consistent from the statistical-physics point of view, as explained in detail below (cf. Appendix A).

The SGA method we are going to discuss here has its own merits. First of all, it is analytic and therefore can be applied to the infinite-size systems. This means also that it can be compared directly with more numerically oriented approaches, where the lattice size is usually limited. Second, it generalizes the Landau concept of the quasiparticle, as well as provides the corresponding effective single-particle Hamiltonian. Third, it



Figure 1. Schematic visualization of division of quantum-liquid state into an effective lattice system composed of cells (modeled by potential valleys with the spin $\frac{1}{2}$ fermions). Every cell can contain up to two fermions with opposite spins, at the price of energy loss U. A number of fermions N_e is assumed in general to differ from the number of all sites N_L, i.e., $N_e < N_L$. Consequently, in the applied field effective masses of the minority spin fermions are enhanced when compared to those of the spin-majority fermions, as discussed in main text.

corrects the principal inconsistency of GA while retaining its attractive qualitative feature by providing a testable approach around the border between the moderate and the strong correlation limits. This is the most difficult regime as then the kinetic and interaction energies are of comparable amplitudes.

In the present paper we have applied SGA method to almost half-filled band situation, where the physics turns out to be non-trivially different from the half-filled case but still the almost-localized character of the system[27, 28, 29, 30] is seen, as discussed below. Such situation with $N_e < N_L$ (there are less fermions than cells) is physically feasible for neutral fermions, whereas for the charged fermions (e.g., electrons) consideration of the non-half-filled band situation requires an additional justification of preserving the charge neutrality of the whole system unless a compensating charge reservoir is assumed. We discuss the results concerning magnetization, magnetic susceptibility, specific heat, as well as the spin-direction dependent effective masses of quasiparticles, in addition to metamagnetism. As an example of concrete application we have also compared resulting from our approach magnetization results with the experimentally obtained magnetization curve[31] for liquid ^{3}He and found a good semiquantitative agreement. The fitting parameter U places this system in the moderate-correlation regime at ambient pressure.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Sec. 2 we discuss the Hubbard model solution within the statistically consistent Gutzwiller approach (SGA). In Sec. 3 we provide main results concerning the dependence of the system properties on applied magnetic field. Sec. 4 contains conclusions and a brief overview. Appendix A provides some details of SGA.

A brief methodological remark is in place here. The description is applicable, strictly speaking, to neutral fermions as we include applied magnetic field only via Zeeman term and ignore the Landau-level structure appearing for charged quantum particles. This approach may be then applied to the discussion of both liquid ^{3}He and to the neutral cold-atom systems of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ in optical lattice systems.

2. Modeling: Statistically consistent Gutzwiller approach (SGA)

Our starting point is the single-band Hubbard Hamiltonian in its translationally invariant form and in the applied magnetic field H_a

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{<ij>,\sigma} t_{ij} \hat{c}^{\dagger}_{i\sigma} \hat{c}_{j\sigma} + U \sum_{i} \hat{n}_{i\uparrow} \hat{n}_{i\downarrow} - \sigma h \sum_{i,\sigma} \hat{n}_{i\sigma}, \tag{1}$$

where the first term expresses single-particle hopping between sites i and j (with the hopping amplitude $t_{ij} < 0$) and the second describes the intra-atomic repulsive interaction characterized by the Hubbard parameter $U > 0$. The applied magnetic field is introduced via the Zeeman splitting (last term), with $h \equiv \frac{1}{2} g \mu_B H_a$, and for spin $\frac{1}{2}$ we have that $\sigma = \pm 1$. In the case of neutral fermions (atoms in either liquid ^{3}He or in an optical lattice) magnetic field enters the Hamiltonian only via this term. Applying

the variational GA procedure[23] we obtain the effective one particle renormalized Hamiltonian in the form:

$$\mathcal{H}_{GA} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} (q_\sigma(d,n,m)\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) - \sigma h)\hat{c}^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\hat{c}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + LUd^2. \tag{2}$$

where $\epsilon(\mathbf{k})$ is the single-particle dispersion relation, $L \equiv N_L$ - the number of lattice sites, d^2 - the probability of having a doubly occupied site, $n = n_\sigma + n_{\bar{\sigma}}$ is the band filling, and $m = n_\sigma - n_{\bar{\sigma}}$ is the uniform magnetic polarization per site. The band narrowing factor $q_\sigma(d,m,n)$ is derived from combinatorial calculations in the usual form (a transparent derivation is provided in Refs. [[9]] and [[7]])

$$q_\sigma = \frac{2\left[\sqrt{(n+\sigma m - 2d^2)(1-n+d^2)} + \sqrt{(n-\sigma m - 2d^2)d^2}\right]^2}{(n+\sigma m)(2-n-\sigma m)}. \tag{3}$$

However, in an applied magnetic field the standard self-consistent GA procedure is insufficient. For achieving the statistical consistency one needs to introduce additional constraints. The essence of the SGA method is discussed in Appendix A. In effect, we introduce new effective Hamiltonian in the form

$$\mathcal{H}_{SGA} \equiv \mathcal{H}_{GA} - \lambda_m(\sum_{i,\sigma}\sigma\hat{n}_{i,\sigma} - mL) - \lambda_n(\sum_{i,\sigma}\hat{n}_{i,\sigma} - nL), \tag{4}$$

where the Lagrange multipliers λ_m and λ_n represent the constraints imposed on m and n that their values calculated self-consistently coincide with those determined variationally. The diagonalization of (4) allows for calculation of the thermodynamic potential functional

$$\mathcal{F}^{SGA} = -\frac{1}{\beta}\sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} ln[1 + e^{-\beta E^{(SGA)}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}}] + L(\lambda_n n + \lambda_m m + Ud^2), \tag{5}$$

where the eigenenergies of quasiparticles are

$$E^{(SGA)}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} = q_\sigma\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} - \sigma(h + \lambda_m) - \mu - \lambda_n. \tag{6}$$

The functional (5) represents the effective Landau functional with order parameters and extra variables expressing the inter-particle correlations.

We see that in order to achieve that the polarization m and the chemical potential μ determined variationally would coincide with those determined in a self-consistent manner, we have effectively introduced corresponding *effective fields* adding to both h and μ. In essence, this procedure assures the fulfillment of the Bogoliubov theorem, discussed originally in the Hartree-Fock approximation, and stating that the introduced effective single-particle approach represents the optimal single-particle representation of the mean-field state. Note also that the Luttinger theorem for Hamiltonian (4) is obeyed, so that the system is represented by a Fermi liquid, i.e., there is a one-to-one correspondence between the bare states (of energies $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$) and the quasiparticle states ($E_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}$ for $h = 0$). A number of renormalizing factors ($q_\sigma, \lambda_m, \lambda_n$) appears though; those are

determined by the statistical consistency (equilibrium) conditions. The presence of those three parameters determined either form self-consistency conditions or variationally represent the features which do not appear in the original Landau theory of Fermi liquid.This is the reason why it is termed either as a correlated or an almost localized Fermi liquid.

The equilibrium values of parameters and mean field are obtained from the following minimizing procedure of generalized grand-potential functional (5) with respect to the variables assembled into a vector $\vec{\lambda} \equiv (m, d, n, \lambda_n, \lambda_m)$ and representing all relevant quantities, determined from the necessary condition for minimum

$$\Big(\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \vec{\lambda}}\Big)_0 = 0, \tag{7}$$

in combination with comparison of $\mathcal{F}$ values for different possible solutions. Explicitly, the above conditions can be rewritten as a set of five self-consistent equations for the corresponding quantities

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_n = -\dfrac{1}{L}\displaystyle\sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \frac{\partial q_\sigma}{\partial n} f(E^{(SGA)}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma})\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}, \\ \lambda_m = -\dfrac{1}{L}\displaystyle\sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \frac{\partial q_\sigma}{\partial m} f(E^{(SGA)}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma})\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}, \\ d = -\dfrac{1}{2LU}\displaystyle\sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \frac{\partial q_\sigma}{\partial d} f(E^{(SGA)}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma})\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}, \\ n = \dfrac{1}{L}\displaystyle\sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} f(E^{(SGA)}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}), \\ m = \dfrac{1}{L}\displaystyle\sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \sigma f(E^{(SGA)}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}), \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

where $f(E)$ is Fermi-Dirac distribution function. Note that the first two equations contain the derivatives of the band narrowing factor with respect to the respective variables and would be absent in the ordinary Hartree-Fock approximation. In the case of GA, the fields $\lambda_m = \lambda_n \equiv 0$; this is the limit of weak coupling and represents one of the checkouts on the method reliability. The grand-potential functional evaluated for the optimal values of components of vector $\vec{\lambda}$, and determined from (8) reduces to the physical grand potential Ω. Once we have determined the equilibrium thermodynamic potential, we can also determine all relevant thermodynamic quantities. For example, the entropy is

$$-S = \frac{d\Omega}{dT} = \Big(\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial T}\Big)_0 + \Big(\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \vec{\lambda}}\Big)_0 \cdot \frac{\partial \vec{\lambda}}{\partial T}, \tag{9}$$

where subscript "0" labels the equilibrium values of variational parameters. Since $\Big(\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial \vec{\lambda}}\Big)_0 = 0$ from the (7), Eq. (9) simplifies to the form

$$S = -\Big(\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial T}\Big)_0 = k_B \sum_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \Big[ln(1 + e^{-\beta E^0_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}}) + \beta E^0_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} f(E^0_{\mathbf{k}\sigma})\Big]. \tag{10}$$

The specific heat is then defined in the usual manner

$$c_V = T\frac{dS}{dT}\Big|_{n,T,h,V} \equiv -T\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{F}}{\partial T^2}\Big|_0. \tag{11}$$

Note that variational parameters depend on temperature in a non-trivial manner. Therefore we have to determine the specific heat numerically. A detailed analysis of the results follows next.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Principal physical properties

To obtain the equilibrium values from solutions of the set of equations (8), we have made use of the scientific library GSL on the GNU license[32]; the precision of the numerical results was 10^{-7}. In our calculations we set energy scale in the units of nearest neighbors hopping $|t|$. We consider a particular closed-packed structure, the three-dimensional face-centered cubic lattice of size 200x200x200. If not specified otherwise, we have taken into account the second-nearest-neighbor hopping set as $t' = 0.25$, the band filling as $n = 0.97$, and the reduced temperature in the system as $\beta \equiv \frac{1}{k_B T} = 500$, which can be regarded practically as $T \approx 0$ limit.

Both approaches, GA as well as SGA, automatically account for renormalization of effective mass (m^*_σ) with respect to the bare band mass (m_B) in the form:

$$\frac{m^*_\sigma}{m_B} = q_\sigma^{-1} \equiv (\frac{\partial E_{\mathbf{k}}}{\partial \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}})^{-1}, \tag{12}$$

where q_σ is the optimized Gutzwiller band-narrowing factor defined in (3). In the absence of applied magnetic field the effective mass for larger values of the interaction is renormalized appreciably, as detailed in Fig.2. However, in the applied magnetic field, in an almost half-filled band we observe their strongly asymmetric dependences with respect to the spin direction. This asymmetry with respect to the value of $\sigma = \pm 1$ is caused by the corresponding m dependence of q_σ. The curves terminate at the saturation point $m = n$, where simultaneously $m_\uparrow = m_B$ and the spin-minority quasiparticle subband becomes empty. Parenthetically, the saturation point may be used thus to determine the value of bare band mass, m_B, as the Hubbard interaction is then switched off. This spin-dependent mass renormalization of quasiparticles in the strong correlation regime has been discussed extensively in the literature [30, 33, 34, 35], and observed experimentally by means of the de Haas-van Alphen oscillations in strong magnetic fields[36, 37]. It thus represents a crucial new concept, which does not appear in the standard Landau Fermi liquid (LFL) theory.

In Fig.3 we show a family of magnetization curves as a function of reduced magnetic field ($h \equiv \mu_B H_a$). In comparison to the results obtained within GA[9, 38] we do not observe any spectacular metamagnetic transition for $n < 1$. The magnetization curves, especially in the intermediate interaction regime, are rather smooth and saturate



Figure 2. Spin-direction dependent effective quasiparticles masses as a function of applied magnetic field for an almost half-filled band ($n = 0.97$). The curves terminate when the magnetization saturates, i.e., when in the spin-majority subband the quasiparticle mass $m_\uparrow = m_B$ (the solid points on the horizontal axis). The evolution is spin asymmetric since q_σ depends on m in this fashion with respect to spin direction $\sigma = \pm 1$.



Figure 3. Magnetization curve for selected values of Hubbard parameter U and fixed band filling $n = 0.97$. Even for very large values of U the curves show a metamagnetic-like transition in the form of a kink.

gradually. Nonetheless we observe a weak kink which we qualify as a metamagnetic-like behavior. Indeed this kink can be singled out clearly on the field dependence of the magnetic susceptibility and the specific heat curves, as shown in Figs.4 and 5, respectively.

One can say that the presence of both spin-dependent masses and the metamagnetic behavior signal an appearance of the so-called almost-localized Fermi liquid (ALFL) state, as such behavior is absent for the Landau Fermi liquid [38]. The diminution of



Figure 4. Magnetic susceptibility ($\chi = \frac{\partial m}{\partial h}$) as a function of reduced magnetic field for selected values of the Hubbard parameter U. In the whole range of U values we observe a discontinuity which we ascribe to the metamagnetic-like behavior. In the lower inset we plot the zoomed curves for smaller values of U parameter. In the upper inset we present dependence the critical field (h_{crit}) representing the metamagnetic-like point for selected values of parameter U.



Figure 5. Specific heat (per site) as a function of reduced magnetic field for selected values of U. The slope change occurs for the same values of h as the kinks in the magnetic susceptibility shown in Fig.4. At lower fields the mass enhancements $\{m^*_\sigma\}$ are symmetric, so their contributions to the total density of states average out to the value roughly independent of h. The temperature was taken as $k_B T = 0.04|t|$.

c_V with h is the sign of a combined decrease of both the effective-masses components, as well as of the decreasing population of the spin-minority subband.

Table 1. Values of the parameters obtained for $U = 12$, $t' = 0.25$, $n = 0.97$, $\beta = 500$ (in units where $|t| = 1$) for four values of reduced magnetic field. The calculations were made for the fcc lattice 200x200x200.

Quantity	$h = 0$	$h = 0.2$	$h = 0.5$	$h = 1$
$\mathcal{F}$	-6.4752954	-6.4765977	-6.4354871	-6.0518362
d	0.3231845	0.31933441	0.2950449	0.2370746
m	0.	0.1690908	0.4483957	0.7206020
μ	5.8387352	5.8227839	5.6845669	4.9815074
λ_n	-5.5747470	-5.5601127	-5.4599753	-5.2141073
λ_m	0.	0.4007685	1.1410240	2.1809003
$q_\uparrow$	0.7250737	0.7293968	0.7482932	0.7971271
$q_\downarrow$	0.7250737	0.7236794	0.7307299	0.7569461

3.2. Subsidiary quantities

Introduction of constraints results in additional self-consistent equations to be obeyed, what in turn restricts the parameter space to look for the proper global minimum of the free-energy functional. Furthermore, the Lagrange multipliers λ_m and λ_n play the role of the effective field and the shift of the chemical potential, respectively. They are induced by the correlations in the sense that their presence is induced by the presence of q_σ and particularly, by its singular dependence on both m and n in the present situation. The fields λ_m and λ_n are determined within the variational/self-consistent procedure and represent the third factor distinguishing ALFL from LFL. For the sake of completeness, we provide in Table 1 the exemplary values of the relevant quantities. Note that λ_n almost compensates μ and in effect we obtain the effective value of the Fermi energy for the heavy quasiparticles.

In Fig. 6 we plot the spin-resolved density of states for the two values of $U = 8$ and 18 (in units of $|t|$) and in an applied field. The spin subbands are shifted by the amount $h + \lambda_m$ and narrowed down asymmetrically by the spin-direction dependent factor q_σ. In the panel displayed as Fig.7a-c we have plotted λ_m, λ_n, and μ, all as a function of h. Additionally, the field λ_m as a function of magnetization m is shown in Fig. 8. This effective field is a nonlinear function of both h and m and represents a relatively fast growing quantity with the increasing h. It is only weakly h dependent in the moderate interaction limit. This means that the presence of λ_m will have an essential impact of magnetic properties, while a relative constancy of μ and λ_n in the regime $h < h_{crit}$ explains a flat behavior of $c_V(T)$ in that regime. It would be interesting to see if the presence of the effective field λ_m acting on the spin degrees of freedom only (in analogy to the Weiss molecular field) can be detected with the same accuracy, as the spin splitting of the masses. Such test would be a decisive step forward in defining an almost localized Fermi liquid as a separate state from the Landau Fermi liquid. Note however, that λ_m cannot be, strictly speaking, considered as a molecular Weiss field,



Figure 6. Spin resolved density of states of quasiparticle states in the applied magnetic field $h = 0.5$ for the selected values of U. The spin (magnetic-moment) minority subbands is narrowed down, whereas the spin-majority-spin subband widens up so that it acquires the bare bandwidth as the saturation state is reached in the strong-field limit.



Figure 7. Panels a-c show evolution of fields λ_m and λ_n and chemical potential μ with respect to the applied magnetic field. The field λ_m appears only in the spin polarized state, whereas λ_n almost compensated μ.

since it is nonlinear in m.



Figure 8. Effective field induced by correlations as a function of magnetization; it illustrates its nonlinear character and in this manner cannot be regarded as a Weiss molecular field.

3.3. Concrete example: liquid ^3He

Liquid ^{3}He is regarded as a canonical example of the Landau Fermi liquid (cf. e.g. Ref. [6]). It has also been regarded as an ALFL, as it undergoes a transition to the solid state at the pressure $p \simeq 34$ *bar*, with the localization of the ^{3}He atoms regarded as a fermions of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ [9, 12, 39]. Here we discuss briefly its behavior in an applied magnetic field at ambient pressure. We have compared magnetization curve obtained from our model to the experimental magnetization[31] of the liquid ^{3}He, as shown in Fig. 9. We find a good overall agreement. Note that our results, obtained for $n < 1$ do not exhibit any discontinuous metamagnetic transition which disqualified the applicability of the standard GA to ^{3}He and with $n = 1$ [9]. To avoid this discontinuity, we have introduced about 5% of vacancies in this virtual fcc lattice representing liquid ^{3}He. This number of vacant sites provides the best fit of our results to the experimental data. Furthermore it is important to note that the relatively small number of holes introduced preserves the almost localized nature of this quantum liquid. This note is important also in the view of the circumstance, that the detailed $m(h)$ dependence is very sensitive to the number of quantum vacancies. It is tempting to suggest that the effective empty-site content $\delta \equiv 1 - n$ of the order of few percents can be interpreted as a presence of quantum vacancies in the liquid state, in direct analogy to the quantum Andreev vacancies postulated and observed in solid ^{3}He[40]. From a detailed analysis of the fitting procedure we conclude that the assumption of a non-half-filled lattice is necessary if either GA, SGA or DMFT approaches and the Hubbard model are to emulate the magnetic behavior of liquid ^{3}He.

One important difficulty of the just discussed results (Fig. 9)) should be raised at this point. Namely, a relatively small value of $U \sim 5|t| \ll W$ (where $W \equiv 24|t|$ is bare band width) obtained from the $m(h)$ best fit places the liquid ^{3}He at ambient pressure



Figure 9. Magnetization in dimensionless units, $m \equiv n_\uparrow n_\downarrow$ vs. applied field H calculated within SGA fitted to the experimental data [31], Fitting parameters are: $U = 5|t|$, $n = 0.95$, $t' = 0.25|t|$, $|t| = 62.5K$. A very weak, almost unnoticeable metamagnetic kink is present. The reason for the small deviation of the results from the data (for $H \gtrsim 125T$) is not accounted for within the present approach.

as a moderately correlated system. This seemingly unexpected conclusion is also in agreement with the DMFT analysis[21]. In this way, the Hubbard-model approach squares also qualitatively with the fundamental Fermi-liquid theory assumption that the interaction between quasiparticles can be essentially limited to the region very close to the Fermi surface (U substantially smaller than W). Furthermore, the method for estimating the number of vacancies might be associated with a detailed study of the field dependence of the specific heat to determine a possible spin-direction dependence of the effective mass, though the weak effect for this moderate value of U may be prove decisive. Such an explicit spin-direction mass dependence is absent when we have exactly half-filled situation (i.e., one atom per site, without any vacant cells).

Additionally, in spite of this success in explaining $m(h)$ in a semiquantitative manner, there still is another problem concerning determination with the same set parameters of a realistic value of the mass enhancement estimated from the $c_V(T)$ curves for $T \to 0$[3, 4]. Namely, the value of the specific-heat enhancement at $h = 0$ obtained for $U = 5|t| \sim W/5$, is far too small to provide the corresponding effective mass enhancement $m^* = 2.86m_0$ at ambient pressure, where m_0 is the free ^{3}He atomic mass. This disagreement is common to the present and the previous[12, 21] treatments. A small mass enhancement within GA, SGA or DMFT of the mass can be interpreted in two ways. First, the spin-fluctuation contribution can be very important[41]. In that situation, SGA should be considered only as a saddle-point approximation to a more complete approach (cf. Appendix B). This question certainly requires a detailed analysis. Second, one has to note, that the m^*/m_0 ratio estimate from the experimental c_V data[3, 4], based on the relations to an ideal gas, may not be fully adequate either. Finally, our assumption that $N_e < N_L$ and $\delta \equiv 1 - n$ independent of h or pressure, may

be analyzed further as well.

4. Conclusions

We have carried out a systematic study of a correlated Fermi liquid modeled by the Hubbard model on fcc lattice, utilizing the statistically consistent Gutzwiller approach (SGA)[42] in an applied magnetic field and in an almost half-filled regime. Within this method, the field and spin direction dependent effective masses, the magnetization curve, the magnetic susceptibility, and the specific heat, were all calculated in a both self-consistent and variationally optimal manner. We have found a metamagnetic-like behavior tracing the discontinuities which would appear for the half-filled band case (one particle per cell). In other words, we have not obtained any first-order metamagnetic transition which limits the original Gutzwiller approach (GA) applicability to real systems such as liquid ^{3}He (see also the discussion in Ref. [21]). Apart from that, GA approach is not statistically consistent, as discussed in detail in the text. We have found a good overall agreement of our approach with experimental data for the liquid ^{3}He magnetization. However, there remains a question of putting into a mutual agreement the magnetization data with the magnitude of effective-mass enhancement observed for that system in zero applied field. The quantitative analysis within the lattice-approach required introducing a small number ($\sim 5\%$) of vacant cells to destroy the strong metamagnetism. A way of including the spin fluctuations is suggested (cf. Appendix B), starting from the SGA state, which should be then regarded as a saddle-point state for a more complete analysis. In this manner, SGA state replaces the Hartree-Fock state regarded so far as a reference (saddle-point) state for further considerations containing spatially inhomogeneous fluctuations[43, 44, 45], here of both spin and charge types.

In summary, our SGA approach, as well as the works carried within DMFT [21, 34, 35] provide a convergent quasiparticle language in the sense that effective masses are spin-direction dependent in the magnetically polarized state. We also introduce a set of nonlinear effective fields determined in a self-consistent manner which renormalize both the chemical potential and the applied field magnitude experienced by the quasiparticles representing the almost localized Fermi liquid. Our method of approach may be regarded as equivalent to the slave-boson approach in the saddle-point approximation[42], without involving slave-boson fields which introduce spurious Bose-condensation phase transitions at nonzero temperature.

Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank Marcin Abram, Jakub Jędrak, and Jan Kaczmarczyk for very useful discussions, and technical help. We also greatly acknowledge cooperation with professor Włodzimierz Wójcik on the early stages of this work. The work has been partially supported by the Foundation for Polish Science (FNP) under the TEAM

program, as well as by the National Science Centre (NCN) under the MAESTRO program, Grant No. DEC-2012/04/A/ST3/00342. Preliminary results of this work have been presented in proceedings of XVI Training Course in the Physics of Strongly Correlated Systems [46].

Appendix A. Statistically consistent Gutzwiller approximation

As pointed out in the main text, it has been noticed (see Ref. [42, 46, 47] and references therein) that the Gutzwiller approximation which leads to the effective single-particle Hamiltonian (2) has a principal drawback. Namely if we try to calculate the ground state energy from $E_G \equiv \langle \mathcal{H}_{GA} \rangle$ we have to determine first the average spin polarization m, the double occupancy probability d^2, and μ first[48]. This can be achieved in two ways: either by minimizing the free-energy functional $\mathcal{F}$ for $T \geq 0$ (defined by Eq. (5 for $\lambda_m = \lambda_n = 0$)) with respect to variables (m, d^2, n) or by writing down the self-consistent equation of m and n and minimizing $\mathcal{F}$ with respect to d^2. Those two procedures should provide the same answers if (2) represents properly defined single-particle Hamiltonian. In fact, the results do differ[42, 47] and this discrepancy is caused by the fact that the single-particle energies depend on q_σ which depends on m and n in a nonanalytic manner (see e.g. the limits $n \to 1$ and/or $m \to 1$). The presence of this discrepancy means that GA violates the fundamental Bogoliubov theorem that the effective single-particle states represents the optimal quasiparticle states in the variational sense, with the ordinary self-consistent procedure preserved at the same time.

To cure this principal defect one can choose the approach in which one imposes the constraints so that the consistency form the point of view of statistical mechanics is preserved. To carry through such a procedure one can utilize the maximum entropy method to derive the correct statistical distribution (with constraints) and then proceed further[47]. Here we have chosen a slightly different path. Namely, we have defined the generalized free energy functional (5) with the constraints that the variationally calculated quantities m and n represent correct values. This is realized by adding the two terms to $\mathcal{H}_{GA}$, as written in Eq. (4). This last step amounts to introducing statistically-consistent Gutzwiller approximation (SGA). In result, we have to minimize $\mathcal{F}$ given by (5) additionally with respect to λ_m and λ_n and the procedure introduces two physically relevant fields (cf. (6)) which appear only in correlated state ($q_\sigma < 1$) and vanish in the small-U limit, i.e., in the Hartree-Fock limit ($q_\sigma \to 1$). The last limiting situation represents thus a test for the correctness of our approach.

One should note that SGA is based essentially on GA, but provides additionally essential consistency of the model by introducing two additional parameters into the

approach. In summary, the self-consistent equations

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{L}\sum_{i,\sigma}\sigma\langle\hat{n}_{i\sigma}\rangle = \frac{1}{L}\sum_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}\sigma\langle\hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\rangle \equiv m, \\ \frac{1}{L}\sum_{i,\sigma}\langle\hat{n}_{i\sigma}\rangle = \frac{1}{L}\sum_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}\langle\hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\rangle \equiv n, \\ \langle\hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}\rangle = \frac{1}{e^{\beta(E_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}-\mu)}+1}, \end{cases} \tag{A.1}$$

are consistent with variational equations (7) derived within the SGA method.

Appendix B. SGA as a saddle-point approximation

Here we would like to sketch the method of extending the SGA approach. In this method SGA is regarded as a saddle-point approximation to a more complete theory which includes the quantum fluctuations.

In general, the constraints in (4) should be written in th local form

$$\begin{aligned} -\Big\{\sum_{i\sigma}\lambda_{mi}\sigma(\hat{n}_{i\sigma}-\langle\hat{n}_{i\sigma}\rangle)+\sum_{i\sigma}\lambda_{ni}(\hat{n}_{i\sigma}-\langle\hat{n}_{i\sigma}\rangle)\Big\} \\ \equiv -\Big\{\sum_{i\sigma}(\lambda_{mi}\delta\hat{S}_i^z-\lambda_{ni}\delta\hat{n}_i)\Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

with $\delta\hat{S}_i^z \equiv \hat{S}_i^z - \langle\hat{S}_i^z\rangle$ and $\delta\hat{n}_i \equiv \hat{n}_i - \langle\hat{n}_i\rangle$. In other words, in the system with fluctuating local quantities, the constraints should be obeyed also locally. Also, the charge fluctuations are expressed via the term

$$U\sum_i(\hat{n}_{i\uparrow}\hat{n}_{i\downarrow}-\langle\hat{n}_{i\uparrow}\hat{n}_{i\downarrow}\rangle). \tag{B.2}$$

The last term can be rewritten in the spin explicit form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{n}_{i\uparrow}\hat{n}_{i\downarrow} = \left(\frac{n_{i\uparrow}-\hat{n}_{i\downarrow}}{2}\right)^2+\frac{\hat{n}_i^2}{4} \\ = (\delta\hat{S}_i^z)^2+2\langle\hat{S}_i^z\rangle\delta\hat{S}_i^z+\langle\hat{S}_i^z\rangle^2+\frac{\hat{n}_i^2}{4}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.3}$$

where $\langle\hat{S}_i^z\rangle \equiv m$ and $\hat{n}_i \equiv \hat{n}_{i\downarrow}+\hat{n}_{i\uparrow}$. In effect, we have

$$U\sum_i\hat{n}_{i\uparrow}\hat{n}_{i\downarrow} = U\sum_i\delta(\hat{S}_i^z)^2+U\sum_i\frac{\hat{n}_i^2}{4}+const. \tag{B.4}$$

One can reformulate the whole approach in the spin rotationally invariant form in a straight forward manner. In effect, we have linear and quadratic spin and charge fluctuations. We thus can define the part of Hamiltonian responsible for fluctuations as

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^{SGA}+\mathcal{H}^{fluct}+const, \tag{B.5}$$

where

$$\mathcal{H}^{fluct} \equiv -\sum_i \left[\lambda_{mi}\delta\hat{S}_i^z - \lambda_{ni}\delta\hat{n}_i\right] + U\sum_i \left[(\delta\hat{S}_i^z)^2 + \frac{1}{4}(\delta\hat{n}_i)^2\right]. \tag{B.6}$$

This expression (B.6)(or their spin-rotation invariant correspondants) should be inserted into the expression for the energy expressed in the functional-integral form over the Fermi fields[48] and then evaluated explicitly, as it involves cumbersome calculations. Methodologically, it is analogous to the slave-boson approach[41]. However, the present approach involves only coherent physical Fermi $\{\hat{c}_{i\sigma}, \hat{c}_{i\sigma}^{\dagger}\}$ and Bose $\{\lambda_m, \lambda_n\}$ fields, without introducing condensing ghost slave-boson fields.

When the reference (saddle-point) system is represented by an almost localized Fermi liquid, both the spin and the charge fluctuations become thus relevant. This should lead to a renormalization of the thermodynamic properties and should be analyzed separately, as in the present paper we concentrate on the $T \to 0$ results. Nonetheless, inclusion of the fluctuations should lead to a further enhancement of the specific heat, as well as to the presence of the $T^3 \ln T$ term for $h = 0$[41].

Bibliography

[1] Landau L., Zh. Exp. Teor. Fiz., 1956, **30**, 1058, [Sov. Phys. JETP **3**, 920, (1957)].
[2] Landau L., Zh. Exp. Teor. Fiz., 1957, **32**, 59, [Sov. Phys. JETP **5**, 101, (1957)].
[3] Greywall D.S., Phys. Rev. B, 1983, **27**, 2747.
[4] Greywall D.S., Phys. Rev. B, 1986, **33**, 7520.
[5] Mook H.A., Phys. Rev. Lett., 1985, **55**, 2452.
[6] Dobbs E., Helium Three, Oxford University Press, 2000.
[7] Gebhard F., The Mott Metal-Insulator Transitions, Springer, 1997.
[8] Spałek J., Gopalan P., Phys. Rev. Lett, 1990, **64**, 2823.
[9] Vollhardt D., Rev. Mod. Phys., 1984, **56**, 99.
[10] Castorina P., Gavani R.V., Satz H., Eur. Phys. J. C, 2010, **69**, 169.
[11] Satz H., Acta Phys. Polon. B, 2012, **43**, 587.
[12] Vollhardt D., Wölfle P., Anderson P.W., Phys. Rev. B, 1987, **35**, 6703.
[13] Scalapino D.J., Rev. Mod. Phys., 2012, **84**, 1383.
[14] Jędrak J., Spałek J., Phys. Rev. B., 2011, **83**, 104512.
[15] Bünemann J., Schickling T., Gebhard F., EPL, 2012, **98**, 27006.
[16] Kaczmarczyk J., Spałek J., Schickling T., Bünemann J., Phys. Rev. B, 2013, **88**, 115127.
[17] Gutzwiller M., Phys. Rev., 1965, **137**, A1726.
[18] Bünemann J., Gebhard F., Thul R., Phys. Rev. B, 2003, **67**, 075103.
[19] Spałek J., J. Sol. St. Chem., 1990, **88**, 70.
[20] Brinkman W.F., Rice T.M., Phys. Rev. B, 1970, **2**, 4302.
[21] Parihari D., Vidhyadhiraja N.S., Taraphder A., J. Phys.: Condens. Matter, 2011, **23**, 055602.
[22] Jarrell M., Phys. Rev. Lett., 1992, **69**, 168.
[23] Jędrak J., Spałek J., Phys. Rev. B, 2010, **81**, 073108.
[24] Kaczmarczyk J., Spałek J., Phys. Rev. B., 2011, **84**, 125140.
[25] Abram M., Kaczmarczyk J., Jędrak J., Spałek J., Phys. Rev. B, 2013, **88**, 094502.
[26] Howczak O., Spałek J., J. Phys.: Condens. Matter, 2012, **24**, 205602.
[27] Spałek J., Datta A., Honig J.M., Phys. Rev. Lett., 1987, **59**, 728.
[28] Spałek J., Kokowski M., Honig J.M., Phys. Rev. B, 1989, **39**, 4175.
[29] Spałek, Physica B, 2005, **654**, 378.
[30] Spałek J., Phys. Stat. Sol. (b), 2006, **78**, 243.

[31] Wiegers S.A.J., Wolf P.E., Puech L., Phys. Rev. Lett., 1991, **66**, 2895.
[32] Galassi M., Davies J., Theiler J., Gough B., Jungman G., Alken P., Booth M., Rossi F., GNU Scientific Library Reference Manual (3rd Ed.), ISBN 0954612078.
[33] Maśka M.M., Mierzejewski M., Kaczmarczyk J., Spałek J., Phys. Rev. B, 2010, **82**, 054509.
[34] Bauer J., Hewson A.C., Phys. Rev. B, 2007, **76**, 035118.
[35] Bauer J., Eur. Phys. J. B, 2009, **68**, 201.
[36] McCollam A., Julian S.R., Rourke P.M.C., Aoki D., Flouquet J., Phys. Rev. Lett., 2005, **94**, 186401.
[37] Sheikin I., Gröger A., Raymond S., Jaccard D., Aoki D., Harima H., Flouquet J., Phys. Rev. B, 2003, **67**, 094420.
[38] Korbel P., Spałek J., Wójcik W., Acquarone M., Phys. Rev. B, 1995, **52**, R2213.
[39] Spałek J., Eur. J. Phys., 2000, **21**, 511.
[40] Andreev A., Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz., 1976, **24**, 608, [JETP Lett. 1976, **24**, 564, (1976)].
[41] Wolfle P., Li T., Z. Phys B, 1990, **78**, 45.
[42] Jędrak J., Kaczmarczyk J., Spałek J., arXiv:1008.0021, 2010.
[43] Hertz J., Phys. Rev. B, 1976, **14**, 1165.
[44] Moriya T., Spin Fluctuations in Itinerant Electron Magnetism, Springer Verlag, 1985.
[45] Millis A.J., Phys. Rev. B, 1993, **48**, 7183.
[46] Wysokiński M., Jędrak J., Kaczmarczyk J., Spałek J., AIP Conf. Proc., 2012, **1485**, 319.
[47] Jędrak J., Real-space pairing in an extened t-J model, Ph.D. Thesis, Jagiellonian University, Kraków, 2011.
[48] Spałek J., Acta Phys. Polon. A, 2012, **121**, 764, cf. Appendix E.